

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 19:53:03 1994
 Message-Id: <MAILQUEUE-101.941111164530.288@vilas.uwex.edu>
 From: "Terry O'Laughlin" <OLAUGHLIN@vilas.uwex.edu>
 Date: 11 Nov 94 16:45:30 CDT
 Subject: 11/11/94 Mil equip list

This is an ongoing project. Any and all are invited to contribute.
 Thanks this week to Mike Crestohl for entries, Bob Folwaczny, Emil
 Kasprzyk for additional information and an anonymous donor for
 photostats of Jane's indexes. (Photostats? I'm showing my age.)

Military Equipment List ----- 11-11-94

```

-----
The Joint Electronics Type Designation                                1
-----                                                                1
e.g. AN/FRR-59A                                                        1
AN - indicates "system"                                              1
/                                                                    1
F - installation                                                       1
R - type of equipment                                                 1
R - purpose                                                            1
-                                                                      1
59 - model number                                                    1
A - modification letter                                              1
-----
installation                  1      type of equipment              1
-----                      1      -----                      1
A - airborne                  1      A - invisible light, heat    1
B - underwater                1      radiation                    1
C - air transportable         1      B - pigeon                    1
D - pilotless carrier         1      C - carrier                    1
F - fixed                     1      D - radiac                     1
G - ground, general           1      E - nupac                     1
K - amphibious                1      F - photographic              1
M - ground, mobile            1      G - telegraph or              1
P - pack, portable            1      teletypewriter                1
S - water surface craft, ship 1      I - interphone and PA         1
T - ground, transportable     1      J - electromechanical         1
U - general, utility           1      K - telemetering              1
V - ground, vehicular         1      L - countermeasures           1
W - water, surface            1      M - meteorological            1
    and underwater            1      N - sound in air              1
-----                      1      P - radar                     1
purpose                        1      Q - sonar                     1
-----                      1      R - radio                     1

```

-----	1	S - special types	1
A - auxiliary assemblies	1	T - telephone (wire)	1
B - bombing	1	V - visual	1
C - communications	1		1
D - direction finding	1	-----	1
E - ejection release			1
G - fire control			1
H - recording			1
L - searchlight control			1
M - maintenance and test assemblies			1
N - navigation aids			1
P - reproducing			1
Q - special or combination of purposes			1
R - receiving			1
S - detecting range bearing			1
T - transmitting			1
W - control			1

-----1

thus an AN/FRR-59A is: system, Fixed Radio Receiver, model no. 59 1

- - - 1

This system is common, but not universal 1

-----1

A note on contract numbers: The office where the contract was 1

issued and the date of issuance is embedded in the contract number.1

1

thus contract 14214-PH-51 (an important Collins contract) was 1

issued in Philadelphia in 1951. Equipment was normally manu- 1

factured the same year (14214-PH-51 is anoteable exception. See 1

Electric Radio, #27 for further information). 1

-----1

Designation	Description
-----	-----
AM-6155/GRT-22	Linear power amp, 225-400mHz, 50w (very conservative) 10w in, Eimac X165Z final, extensive metering, can be converted to 116-150mHz, rack mount 7" high, 80 lbs, ITT (model 3212)
AN/FRR-59	Receiver, 2-32mHz, four bands, mechanical digital dial, USB/LSB/ISB/AM/CW, 7&9 pin tubes, triple-conversion: 1625-1725/220/80kHz, 25-1/4h X 22"w X 24"d, 300 lbs, National Radio
AN/GRC-109	Radio Set, Special Forces, 3-22 MHz, consists of: T-784/GRC-109 transmitter, R-1004/GRC-109 receiver,

PP-2685 AC power supply, PP-2684 AC/DC power supply.
See RS-1 and individual entries.

BC-1255	Receiver, 70-150MHz, vacuum tube, 6 INCH cube, R. L. Drake
CU-1638/GR	Antenna coupler, 6 receiver distribution amp, 2-30MHz, 3 dB gain, 7 dB max noise figure, 50 ohm in & out, "N" connectors, rack mount 3-1/2" high, 15 lbs
CV-116/URR	FSK converter, receive only, 450-510kHz IF, rack mount 8-3/4", 80 lbs
CV-1892/TSC-26	SSB converter, USB/LSB, 455kHz IF, nuvistors, audio, carrier & sub-carrier meters, AFC, rack mount 5-1/4", 29 lbs
ME-165/G	Standing Wave Ratio Power Meter, internal 50 ohm/600 watt dummy load, 0-600 watt meter, uses twelve 600 ohm non-inductive resistors, 9.8"h X 10.5"w X 9.8"d, 20 lbs, designed for T-368
PP-2684	Power supply for T-784/GRC-109 and R-1004/GRC-109, input 75, 90, 110, 130, 150, 180, 220, 260 VAC and 6 VDC, output 6.3 VAC @ 1.5A, 450 VDC @ 100 mA, 1.5 VDC @ 300 mA, 108 VDC @ 20 mA regulated, 10" X 8.5" X 5.5", 28 pounds, Admiral Corporation, 1962-1969. Part of AN/GRC-109.
PP-2684A	as above, except different case and cover fasteners. Oklahoma Aerotronics Inc., 1969-1973.
PP-2685	Power supply for T- 784/GRC-109 and R-1004/GRC-109, Input 75, 90, 110, 130, 150, 180, 220, 260 VAC. Output same as PP-2684. 8-1/2" X 5-1/2" X 5-1/2", 12 pounds, Admiral Corporation, 1962-1969
PP-2685A	as above, except different case and cover fasteners. Oklahoma Aerotronics Inc., 1969-1973.
R-389	Receiver, 15-1500kHz, 2 ranges, 7 bands, mechanical digital dial, PTO, AM/CW, bandwidths: 0.1/1/2/4/8kHz, (0.1&1 xtal), 7&9 pin tubes, autotune, dual audio chains, squelch, rack mount 10-1/2" high, 90 lbs.

contract	year	manufacturer	quantity
-----	----	-----	-----
14214-PH-51	1951	Collins Radio	unknown

R-390 Receiver, 0.5-32mHz, thirty-two 1mHz bands, mechanical digital dial, PTO, AM/CW, bandwidths: 0.1/1/2/4/8/16kHz (0.1&1 xtal, no mech filters), 7&9 pin and 2-6082 tubes(hv reg), dual audio chains, squelch, two RF stages, 125 ohm balanced antenna in w/twinax and unbalanced w/"C" connectors, rack mount 10-1/2" high, 90 lbs, production:

contract	year	manufacturer	quantity
14214-PH-51	1951	Collins Radio	unknown
26579-PH-52	1952	Motorola	unknown

R-390A Receiver, 0.5-32mHz, thirty-two 1mHz bands, mechanical digital dial, PTO, AM/CW, bandwidths: 0.1/1/2/4/8/16 kHz (0.1&1 xtal, others mech), 7&9 pin tubes, dual audio chains, single RF stage, 125 ohm balanced ant in w/twinax or unbalanced w/"C" connector, rack mount 10-1/2" high, 85 lbs, production:

contract	year	manufacturer	quantity
14214-PH-51	1955	Collins Radio	300-400
63-PH-54	1955	Motorola	10,000
375-PH-54	1955	Collins Radio	10,000
08719-PH-55	1956	Collins Radio	10,000
14-PH-56	1956	Motorola	10,000
14385-PH-58	1958	Motorola	10,000
42428-PC-58	1959	Stewart-Warner	10,000
20139-PC-60-A1-51	1960	Stewart-Warner	10,000
23137-PC-60	1960	Electronic Asst. Corp.	10,000
21852-PC-61	1961	Capehart Corp.	10,000
35064-PC-62	1962	Amelco	10,000
37856-PC-63	1963	Teledyne/Imperial	10,000
DA-36-039-SC-81547	1963	Stewart-Warner	10,000
FR-11-022-C-4-26418(E)	1966	Comm. Systems	10,000
FR-36-039-N-6-00189(E)			
or DAAB05-67-C-0155	1967	Electronic Asst. Corp.	10,000

(information from ER #24 & #27, Ray NODMS & Wally K50P)

R-391 Receiver, identical to R-390 except w/8 channel autotune mechanical memory (requires external 24VDC 10amp supply), 95 lbs, production:

contract	year	manufacturer	quantity
21852-PH-50-93	1950	Collins	unknown
14214-PH-51	1951	Collins	unknown

11424-PH-51

1951 Collins

unknown

R-392 Receiver, 0.5-32mHz, thirty-two 1mHz bands, mechanical digital dial, PTO, AM/CW, bandwidths: 2/4/8kHz, 7&9 pin & octal tubes including 26A6, 26A7, 26C6 & 26D6, ruggedized vehicular case: 11-1/2"h X 14-1/2"w X 11"d, 58 lbs, 28VDC 5amps, production:

contract	date	manufacturer	quantity
3075-PH-51	1951	Collins Radio	unknown
11653-PH-52	1952	Collins (subcontracts to Stewart-Warner and Stromberg-Carlson)	unknown
52713-PP-61	1961	Dubrow Electronic Ind.	unknown

R-1004/GRC-109 Receiver, 3-22 MHz, three bands, mechanical analog dial, AM/CW, 6 tubes (1T4, 1U5, 1L6), single conversion, 455 KHz, 8-1/2" X 5-1/2" X 5-1/2", 11 pounds, Admiral Corporation, 1.4 VDC @ 300 mA, 108 VDC @ 30 mA, 1962 - 1969. Part of AN/GRC-109.

R-1004A/GRC-109 as above, except different case and cover fasteners. Oklahoma Aerotronics Inc., 1969 - 1973.

R-1051 Receiver, 2-30mHz, direct dial frequency synthesis, 0.5kHz increments, USB/LSB/ISB/AM/FSK, bandwidths: 3.1/6kHz (tied to mode), solid-state except for two rf tubes, 7"h X 17.4"w X 18.9"d, 84 lbs

R-1051B As above except tunes to 0.1kHz increments.

R-1307 Receiver/freq. selective voltmeter, 0.3-800kHz, six bands, analog dial, AM/FM/USB/LSB/CW, bandwidths: 1/2/4/8kHz, 7&9 pin/nuvistor tubes, rack mount 9"h, 25 lbs, Rycom (Railway Communications)

R-1401 Receiver, 1-600kHz, 6 digit electronic counter w/DAFC, AM/CW/USB/LSB/MCW/FSK, bandwidths: 0.15/1/3/6kHz, solid-state w/nixies in counter, ant attn, noise blanker, s-meter, rack mount 3.5"h, 34 lbs, Communications Electronics Inc. (model 357)

R-1420/URR Receiver, 30-300mHz, two bands/tuners, analog filmstrip dial, bandwidths: 20/300kHz, nuvistors and solid-state, rack mount 3.5"h, Communications Electronics, Inc. (model 905A)

R-1490A/G	Variant of R-1401, specs unknown
R-2174/URR	Receiver/freq. selective voltmeter, 0.3-420kHz, six bands, analog dial, AM/USB/LSB, bandwidths: 0.1/3/10 kHz, 7&9 pin tubes, rack mount 9" high, 25 lbs, Rycom (Railway Communications)
RT-671	Transceiver, 2-11.999MHz, 20/100w PEP, USB, digital /1kHz steps, solid-state except: 5907, 7761, 7905 & PL-177WA final, 7"h X 21-1/4"w X 13-1/2"d, 45 lbs, Collins Radio, 24VDC 20amps or 115VAC 400Hz
T-195/GRC-19	Transmitter, 1.5-20mHz, 80-100w plate mod AM/CW, 4 bands, PT0, autotune, antenna coupler, 4X150D final 2-4X150D mod, 11-1/2h X 22w X 14-1/4d, 135 lbs, 28VDC 42amps, Collins Radio
T-368/URT	Transmitter, 1.5-20mHz, 450w CW, 400w plate mod AM, 4 bands, PT0, 4-400 final, 4-125 mod, 41-1/2"h X 32"w X 31"d, 650 lbs, 115VAC single-phase 2200w (AM)
T-784/GRC-109	Transmitter, 3-22MHz, three bands, crystal control (FT-243), CW, 6AC7 oscillator, 2E26 final amp, built-in key, high-speed keyer port for AN/GRA-71, 8-1/2" X 5-1/2" X 5-1/2", 12 pounds, Admiral Corp., 6.3 VAC or VDC @ 1.5A, 450 VDC @ 100mA, 1962 - 1969. Part of AN/GRC-109
T-784A/GRC-109	as above, except different case and cover fasteners, Oklahoma Aerotronics Inc, 1969-1973. Part of AN/GRC-109
URR-52B	Receiver, 30-1000mHz, analog dials, four bands/ tuners, AM/FM/CW bandwidths: 20/75/300kHz, built-in SDU, nuvistors and solid-state, rack mount 5.25"h, Communications Electronics, Inc. (model RS-111)

Edited by Terry O'Laughlin, WB9GVB

Contributors: Mike Crestohl, Bob Folwaczny, Emil Kasprzyk, Terry O'Laughlin

Additions, corrections and suggestions? Ask for a volunteer submission guide from olaughlin@vilas.uwex.edu or landline at (608) 258-1810

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Sat Nov 12 01:58:52 1994
Message-Id: <m0r6BV6-0002AFC@aupair.cs.athabascau.ca>
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 94 22:59 MST
From: tech@cs.athabascau.ca (Richard Loken)
Subject: a Canadian source for service information

Service information for Canadian production radio and television equipment used to be produced by the Radio College of Canada (who actually are a college...), this material is still available through:

Lewcor Communications
243 College Street Suite 305
Toronto, Ontario M5T 2Y1

(416)971-4170

A lot of Canadian production was different from the production of US manufacturers under the same name. As an example, I went off to get service data on a Westinghouse hollow state colour TV number CP1950U and Sams Photofact had never heard of it or anything like it.

Stuff this name in the back of your mind, it may be useful some day.

Richard Loken VE6BSV, Systems Programmer - VMS : "...underneath those
Athabasca University : tuques we wear, our heads
Athabasca, Alberta Canada : are naked!"
** tech@cs.athabascau.ca ** : - Aurthor Black

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 19:08:56 1994
Message-Id: <199411112139.QAA11055@duality.gnu.ai.mit.edu>
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 94 14:37:53 MST
From: Jack Taylor <n7oo@huachuca-emh8.army.mil>
Subject: BC-610 versions?

My quest for a BC-610 has turned up a line on a BC-610E. Can anyone on the net provide insight on the various versions and is there any particular version that makes it more desirable than others?

Also, this particular unit doesn't have tubes or documentation with it. I'm not sure what the complete tube line-up is. Any guidance on locating tubes and a service manual would be deeply appreciated.

73 de Jack

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 18:57:17 1994
From: djw@unlinfo.unl.edu (daniel wright)
Message-Id: <9411112122.AA04685@unlinfo.unl.edu>

Subject: Blatherings
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 15:21:57 -0600 (CST)

Gentlemen...and Ladies if there be:

Please accept my humble and sincere apology if you received duplicate or triplicate copies of my recent obfuscations...the problem is FIXED....I hope...;-]
73 de Dan -- WA0JRD

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 10:41:27 1994
From: KANAMAA%AMGATE%MATRXA@randb.abbott.com
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 08:43:32 -0500 (CDT)
Subject: Dumbing Down in the 90's
Message-Id: <01HJCI6UHP4IFOD6FQ@RANDB.PPRD.Abbott.Com>

>From: Kana, Michael (D9CY)
Date: Fri, Nov 11, 1994 8:46 AM
Subject: Dumbing Down in the 90's
To: boatanchors
Howdy All

First of all, I am very happy to see that such a controversial subject has been discussed in a gentlemanly manner. Hats off to the net. (I think we could consider Boatanchors to be the 160 meters of the internet)

Growing up in the 70's/80's, I have witnessed with some sadness at how technology has dumbed down the technically inclined. I have quite a few engineering friends who did most of their work in the post war years when there was plenty of good surplus junkie to build things and construction was encouraged. I kind of wish I was born 20 years earlier.

It is no surprise that the industry wants to make more money - after all, that is the name of the game. Even if it involves the potential unrepairable damage to the HF bands as we know them today.

I guess that the ham community that does give a darn voice their opinions. Hopefully, with enough effort, the damage can be minimized or eliminated all together.

I think that there is still a tremendous interest in the technological aspect of ham radio - spanning vintage gear to microwave thingies. Those are my current interest - I like vintage gear because it

encourages technical knowhow to get in and fix/maintain. I work with microwaves because you just cant run to AES or HRO to buy the latest FT-TS-IC 99999990000DX plug in modules for 10 ghz. Usually, you either build a kit or hope some nice surplus comes your way.

One thing that does concern me is the fact that we might loose some microwave bands with the spectrum auctions. How ironic... Back in ye olden daze, the hams had to take those useless shortwave bands while the commercial interest kept the LF stuff. Now, we might just give up the high bands to move back to the primordial LF/VLF range. Whars my SP600VLF?!

73's de AA9IL
Mike Kana

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 17:15:49 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 94 09:48:24 HST
From: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
Message-Id: <9411111948.AA04287@kahuna.math.hawaii.edu>
Subject: Dumbing down...

-H wrote:

>Not if your intention is to be a shrill alarmist, and to incite rather than
>to inform.
>-H.

``Shrill alarmist''? ``Incite''? How did you read those terms into slow code => 600,000 US amateurs on HF => possible demand for narrow bandwidth-only modes? The fact that the manufacturers are discussing the slow code proposal means we should be discussing means to counter-act the proposal. A quick listen to 2M in any large city will reveal what happens when the code requirement is lowered/deleted.

Joseph wrote:

>There are many skill / knowledge areas which make up amatuer radio. Code is
>only one.

True, but on HF code ramains one of the two top modes. And by my informal counts from here in the Central Pacific, nearly 50% of the QSO are conducted via code.

>To connect the possibility of a change to slow code to the banning
>of AM is not rational nor is it smart for the long run health of vintage
>radio.

Have you worked DX pileups, Joseph? Now imagine 600,000 US amateurs
on HF *every* weekend. Every frequency will be a pileup! If you are
truely worried about the health of vintage radio, but even more impor-
tantly, the health of HF, you shouldn't ignore this dicussion.

>I sometimes think that many want to keep the growth of amateur radio
>to a minimum to preserve their little bailiwicks. Actually, they may cause
>the death of amateur radio as there are lots of commercial folks out there
>who would love to own our frequencies.
>Joseph Pinner +
>Lafayette, LA
>KC5IJD

There's only a finite amount of HF spectrum. A quick listen to the
ex ham band 11M will reveal what happens when you try to stuff too
many operators in one band. But, the nocode license has allowed *anyone*
to join the service/hobby and with the vast expanse of spectrum above
30 Mc it would be ridiculous to think some would want to limit the growth
of the service *in that direction*. Commercial growth is occuring above
30 Mc, not below, so the nocode license will help to preserve our bands
in that region.

Keep in mind that if the commercial folks wanted HF spectrum we never
would have been given three new bands (12, 17, 30M).

Actually, there really are no barriers to gaining HF access - a current
thread on rec.radio.amateur.misc has revealed just how little time is
needed to attain 5wpm code speed (one fellow reported 5wpm in 5days!)

Jeff NH6IL (ex WA6QIJ, ex NMO CW op)

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 11:39:17 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 09:54:46 -0500
From: Nick England <nick@cs.unc.edu>
Message-Id: <199411111454.JAA02406@altair.cs.unc.edu>
Subject: forward - help needed

DO NOT REPLY TO ME - REPLY TO THE POSTER
=====

rec.radio.amateur.equipment #7220 (4 more)
>From: cornelius@eisner.decus.org (George Cornelius)
Subject: need info on unknown Hallicrafters receiver
Date: Thu Nov 10 15:50:48 EST 1994
Organization: DECUServe
Lines: 27

A friend of mine purchased a Hallicrafters shortwave receiver at a swap meet and needs to know what model number it is. There does not seem to be a model number on the radio, and not only is there no tube placement diagram, but the tubes that were in it are obviously not the right ones.

It is a relatively small table-top receiver, perhaps 12" wide and 8" high, with a large slide-rule dial. The tubes are octal-based, and it is a transformerless, "AC-DC" design. Looks like 35Z5 and 50L6 are supposed to be two of the tubes, although some RF/IF style metal-can tubes had been placed in those sockets instead.

Any ideas what set he has, and what tubes it will need?

Also: there's something missing underneath. Looks like it might be an antenna coil or oscillator coil - wires were clipped coming from the band switch, and one of the brackets remains with a small piece of what might have been a small coil form. I suppose he will have to wind a new coil from scratch if that is what it is, so if anyone has a matching set that we can get dimensions from, it would be very helpful.

He could also use a circuit diagram for it if you happen to have one.

Thanks in advance for anything you come up with!

--

George Cornelius cornelius@eisner.decus.org
WB0RRB cornelius@mayo.edu

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 16:23:33 1994
Message-Id: <m0r5yy3-0007PRC@beacons.cts.com>
Subject: Guess I'm really an OF
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 94 8:36:49 PST
From: Kevin Sanders <kevin@beacons.cts.com>

Gang,

I guess this makes me an OF -- the latest thread regarding "dumbing down" and Code Lite is not what I want to see in my mailbox from this list. It's fine for those who want to discuss it to do so, but this is not the proper forum. I've been very pleased at the relatively noise-free nature

of the list so far, so please show some restraint and keep your posts relevant to boatanchors.

The one thing I have gotten out of this thread is, if I want to try some AM I had better get off my *ss and get a station on the air soon in case the worst does happen.

Jeff, I think you started this on purpose ;-) Need an untainted audience 'cuz you got kicked around too much on the r.r.a.* forums?

73,

Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ
kevin@beacons.cts.com

```
-----  
| o o \_/ o o |  
| o o @ o o |  
-----
```

Try Boatanchors
For A Real Lift

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 19:17:10 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 94 22:37:01 UTC
Message-Id: <144@ki5sl.ampr.org>
From: ki5sl@ki5sl.ampr.org (Rick_Blank)
Subject: Re: Guess I'm really an OF

In message <m0r5yy3-0007PRC@beacons.cts.com> kevin@beacons.cts.com writes:

> Gang,

>

> I guess this makes me an OF -- the latest thread regarding "dumbing down"
> and Code Lite is not what I want to see in my mailbox from this list. It's
> fine for those who want to discuss it to do so, but this is not the
> proper forum. I've been very pleased at the relatively noise-free nature
> of the list so far, so please show some restraint and keep your posts
> relevant to boatanchors.

>

> The one thing I have gotten out of this thread is, if I want to try some
> AM I had better get off my *ss and get a station on the air soon in case
> the worst does happen.

>

> Jeff, I think you started this on purpose ;-) Need an untainted audience
> 'cuz you got kicked around too much on the r.r.a.* forums?

>

> 73,

>

>

> Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ
> kevin@beacons.cts.com

```
-----  
| o o \_/ o o |  
| o o @ o o |  
-----
```

Try Boatanchors
For A Real Lift

>

>

I think we ALL need to get back on the air with our Boatanchor AM rigs and use a little of the spectrum we have available and make a few new friends (and probably some unknowledgeable enemies) and just in general, put a few more of these rigs on something else besides 75M....anyone want to try a sked?

Rick Blank, KI5SL
ki5sl@sat.ampr.org
2223 Blanco Road
San Antonio, Texas 78212
end

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Sat Nov 12 01:22:04 1994
Date: Sat, 12 Nov 1994 00:16:35 -0500 (EST)
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
Subject: Re: Guess I'm really an OF
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941111231010.26163A-100000@access1.digex.net>

On Fri, 11 Nov 1994, Kevin Sanders wrote:

> I guess this makes me an OF -- the latest thread regarding "dumbing down"
> and Code Lite is not what I want to see in my mailbox from this list. It's
> fine for those who want to discuss it to do so, but this is not the
> proper forum. I've been very pleased at the relatively noise-free nature
> of the list so far, so please show some restraint and keep your posts
> relevant to boatanchors.

Kevin,

You have a ways to go to qualify for the "OF" award. My amateur license is three years older than you and I'm certainly not old enough to be one! ;-)

Seriously though, from the comments, I believe that most here would agree that these subjects are quite relevant to the Boatanchors list. They pertain directly to preserving traditional amateur radio as we know and love it. If they aren't relevant, then I'm in the wrong place.

> The one thing I have gotten out of this thread is, if I want to try some
> AM I had better get off my *ss and get a station on the air soon in case
> the worst does happen.

In addition to that, perhaps you might consider putting similar energy into helping preserve our little piece of the pie. The others are already promoting their interests and you can bet your bottom dollar that they don't have AM (or for that matter, probably CW) anywhere on their "gimme" lists.

> Jeff, I think you started this on purpose ;-) Need an untainted audience
> 'cuz you got kicked around too much on the r.r.a.* forums?

Don't blame Jeff. I'm the one who got permission from K4KYV to distribute his "Slow Code" text and I passed it along to Jeff. He just beat me to punch at posting it here. ;-)

73,

Tony
K4KY0

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Sat Nov 12 03:18:57 1994
From: emd@ham.island.net (Robert Smits)
Subject: Re: Guess I'm really an OF
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 23:00:00 PST
Message-Id: <111194230025Rnf0.79b4@ham.island.net>

Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net> writes:

>
>On Fri, 11 Nov 1994, Kevin Sanders wrote:
>
>> I guess this makes me an OF -- the latest thread regarding "dumbing down"
>> and Code Lite is not what I want to see in my mailbox from this list. It's
>> fine for those who want to discuss it to do so, but this is not the
>> proper forum. I've been very pleased at the relatively noise-free nature
>> of the list so far, so please show some restraint and keep your posts
>> relevant to boatanchors.
>

Here I agree heartily. I don't think of any of the "dumb" discussion as relevant to boat anchors. I think it properly belongs in r.r.a.policy or one of the other wreck.radio groups.

>Kevin,
>
>You have a ways to go to qualify for the "OF" award. My amateur license
>is three years older than you and I'm certainly not old enough to be
>one! ;-)
>
>Seriously though, from the comments, I believe that most here would agree
>that these subjects are quite relevant to the Boatanchors list. They
>pertain directly to preserving traditional amateur radio as we know and
>love it. If they aren't relevant, then I'm in the wrong place.
>

I'm sorry, but I think you are in the wrong place with this thread. I haven't commented on it before because I was hoping for this thread to go away, and we'd get back to equipment and history, not amateur politics. I get enough of that in other areas.

>> The one thing I have gotten out of this thread is, if I want to try some
>> AM I had better get off my *ss and get a station on the air soon in case
>> the worst does happen.

>

>In addition to that, perhaps you might consider putting similar energy
>into helping preserve our little piece of the pie. The others are already
>promoting their interests and you can bet your bottom dollar that they don't
>have AM (or for that matter, probably CW) anywhere on their "gimme" lists.
>

A lot of us may be doing just that without feeling the need to spill the sometimes nasty aroma of amateur politics into the b.a.list. Even more so when American amateur politics have no relevance to me whatever, although American boat anchors sure do!

Now that the subject has been thoroughly canvassed, can we go back to thermionic emission devices?

--

Robert Smits
VE7EMD
Ladysmith B.C.
e-mail: emd@ham.island.net

There is *no* idiotproof filter.
Idiots are proof against anything!
- Richard Chycoski, VE7CVS

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 16:21:51 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 14:51:52 -0500 (EST)
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
Subject: Hallicrafter Mystery
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.941111144612.12465D-1000000@access1.digex.net>

> rec.radio.amateur.equipment #7220 (4 more)
> From: cornelius@eisner.decus.org (George Cornelius)
> Subject: need info on unknown Hallicrafters receiver
> Date: Thu Nov 10 15:50:48 EST 1994
> Organization: DECUServe
> Lines: 27
>
> A friend of mine purchased a Hallicrafters shortwave receiver at a swap meet
> and needs to know what model number it is. There does not seem to be a model
> number on the radio, and not only is there no tube placement diagram, but

> the tubes that were in it are obviously not the right ones.
>
> It is a relatively small table-top receiver, perhaps 12" wide and 8"
> high, with a large slide-rule dial. The tubes are octal-based, and
> it is a transformerless, "AC-DC" design. Looks like 35Z5 and 50L6
> are supposed to be two of the tubes, although some RF/IF style metal-
> can tubes had been placed in those sockets instead.

My guess is that it's either an S-53 or S-53A. If it is 13x7x7-3/4, has 7 tubes, and covers 5 bands covering .54-31 MHz, and 49-54.5 MHz., that may be it.

73,

Tony
K4KY0

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 19:51:05 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 17:03:11 -0700
Message-Id: <199411120003.RAA15219@Freenet.HSC.Colorado.EDU>
From: al511@freenet.hsc.colorado.edu (Robert Neece)
Subject: Hallicrafter Mystery

In response to the request to identify an unknow Hallicrafters receiver, Tony, K4KY0, writes:

>> It is a relatively small table-top receiver, perhaps 12" wide and 8"
>> high, with a large slide-rule dial. The tubes are octal-based, and
>> it is a transformerless, "AC-DC" design. Looks like 35Z5 and 50L6
>> are supposed to be two of the tubes, although some RF/IF style metal-
>> can tubes had been placed in those sockets instead.
>
>My guess is that it's either an S-53 or S-53A. If it is 13x7x7-3/4, has 7
>tubes, and covers 5 bands covering .54-31 MHz, and 49-54.5 MHz., that may
>be it.

The S-53A had a *small* sliderule dial. The mystery rig sounds more like an S-38E, which was an AC-DC set, of the specified dimensions, with a *large* sliderule dial. And, wasn't the S-53A AC only?

--

73 de Bob, K0KR

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 10:05:18 1994
From: "Tom Alverson" <TOMA@s1.xetron.com>
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 08:48:56 EST

Subject: KWS-1 umbilical cable needed
Message-Id: <1FAB09E7749@s1.xetron.com>

A friend of mine just bought an old KWS-1 that had its interconnecting cable severed (the one between the power supply base and the transmitter). Does anyone have an old parted out KWS-1 that would have either the cable or the connector to make up a new one.

Email me here or call him direct

he is Jack Giehl WB8BFS 513-683-2676

toma@xetron.com Tom NU8D

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 09:02:11 1994
From: Scott_Johnson-AZAX60@email.sps.mot.com
Date: 11 Nov 94 07:10:59 -0600
Subject: RE>Licensing Observations
Message-Id: <"Macintosh */PRMD=MOT/ADMD=MOT/C=US/"@MHS>

Reply to: RE>Licensing Observations

The last time I suggested what this fellow did, I was blasted by the CW'ers. I still believe the Experimenter should have a place on the HF bands, and that a sufficiently difficult technical exam would keep the brainless appliance operators away. I don't think you are an eliteist, just a very reasonable and logical ham. I wish there were more of you. I for one am working on my CW, and hope to test for extra by the end of the year, but I don't see why I should be punished because the code is difficult for me. I have absolutely nothing against CW ops, in fact I love the fact that they are preserving what is now more of an art than a mode of emission. I just wish there would a little more open mindedness out there. What is wrong with extra technical testing in lieu of code for those who wish it? BTW!! we are digressing once again, and I'm guilty, after all, this is boat anchors.

A lot has been talked about on the list here about whether it is good or bad to reduce the requirements for admission into the higher echelons of amateur radio.

My personal observations of a lot of the folks that have come into the hobby from the "codeless" ranks are sometimes quite ignorant of proper operating procedures, of how the different modes "work", and of the history and historical equipment used in ham radio. This is just observations made of people I know and have talked to, on the air and off.

There is a group of SSB'ers that have started using 3870 as

"their" frequency. I know several of the fellows and get along well with them. When they first started using the frequency heavily a little over a year ago, I talked to a couple of them, in person, and dropped the hint that that was in an "unofficial" AM window...the kindest response I got was "BFD". Recently a gent who is now signing /AG and I were talking and he said: "Boy, those AM'ers were really tearing up the band last night, splatterin' and howlin' all over the place." (His rig is a TS-140) I proceeded to ask him how he discerned that they were "splatterin'". His reply was that he could hear the "howl" and then hear them on both sidebands when he tuned to zero beat, therefore, they must be doing something wrong....this guy has a general class license? He is a perfect example of "buy a ricebox, put it on the air, disengage brain, engage mouth" hams.

I guess that I must be some kind of elitist scumbag because I don't believe someone with as limited a knowledge of radio modes and operation should have a general class license. If "they" want to reduce code requirements, then "they" should increase the technical requirements...Yes, I am only an advanced, I have passed the extra written, but I do not use CW enough to earn the 20wpm priveledges, so I have not earned the Extra class license, I guess I am too busy fooling with the old iron! Give me more technical tests, and I will take them!

A buddy who is an extra has complained that once he got the Extra license, there were no more tests to challenge his technical knowledge...he does use 35+ wpm CW...

Also, before you start accusing me of "Japan bashing" on the ham rigs, I do have several current vinatage riceboxes, both HF and VHF-UHF, and feel that they are good pieces of gear with no American alternatives available, i.e., the mobile dualbanders I use and my satellite rigs, so, I don't consider myself out of the loop on the new stuff either...each has it's place....I wouldn't like to drive a restored MG-TC everywhere I go (if I had one!) and running the BC-610 with a mechanical teletypewriter and the FSK converters would be about the same exercise! It can be done, but, that's a bit more than even I am willing to sacrifice!

The weekend is coming up, I hope everyone has a good one!

73 for now,

Rick Blank, KI5SL
ki5sl@sat.ampr.org
2223 Blanco Road

San Antonio, Texas 78212
end

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 19:28:26 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 13:18:04 -0800 (PST)
From: paul Veltman <veltman@netcom.com>
Subject: Licensing Observations
Message-Id: <Pine.3.89.9411111322.A9232-0100000@netcom11>

On Fri, 11 Nov 1994 Scott_Johnson-AZAX60@email.sps.mot.com wrote:

>
> Reply to: RE>Licensing Observations
> What is wrong with extra technical testing in lieu
> of code for those who wish it.
>
Absolutely nothing!

>
> A lot has been talked about on the list here about whether it is
> good or bad to reduce the requirements for admission into the
> higher echelons of amateur radio.
>
I've never been in favor of this so-called "incentive licensing" that was pushed through in 1968 by the ARRL. Just like this stupider than hell call sign setup that they have now. Every time that someone tries to make a distinction between two classes of people, it creates animosity and bad feelings. As far as I am concerned, there is only one class or echelon of ham radio operator. We should go back to the "class a and b" licenses and forget the rest.

> My personal observations of a lot of the folks that have come into
> the hobby from the "codeless" ranks are sometimes quite ignorant
> of proper operating procedures, of how the different modes "work", and
> of the history and historical equipment used in ham radio.

That's not their fault. Get up off your fat ass and teach them the right way to do it. That will make a real ham out of them, and you too.

> There is a group of SSB'ers that have started using 3870 as
> "their" frequency. I know several of the fellows and get along
> well with them. When they first started using the frequency

> heavily a little over a year ago, I talked to a couple of them, in
> person, and dropped the hint that that was in an "unofficial" AM
> window...the kindest response I got was "BFD". Recently a gent
> who is now signing /AG and I were talking and he said: "Boy,
> those AM'ers were really tearing up the band last night,
> splatterin' and howlin' all over the place." (His rig is a TS-140)
> I proceeded to ask him how he discerned that they were
> "splatterin'". His reply was that he could hear the "howl" and
> then hear them on both sidebands when he tuned to zero beat,
> therefore, they must be doing something wrong....this guy has a
> general class license? He is a perfect example of "buy a ricebox,
> put it on the air, disengage brain, engage mouth" hams.
>

See above remark. And since when is 3870 reserved for your exclusive use? It's always been the rule that the first station to occupy a given frequency has squatters rights. Again, give this guy a call and explain AM to him, he'll learn something, and maybe you will too. And you will have the satisfaction of knowing that you helped a new ham out.

> I guess that I must be some kind of elitist scumbag because I
> don't believe someone with as limited a knowledge of radio modes
> and operation should have a general class license.

Yeah, this is the first correct thing that you've said all day.

> If "they" want
> to reduce code requirements, then "they" should increase the
> technical requirements...Yes, I am only an advanced, I have passed
> the extra written, but I do not use CW enough to earn the 20wpm
> priveledges, so I have not earned the Extra class license, I guess
> I am too busy fooling with the old iron! Give me more technical
> tests, and I will take them!

So what! Put your time into making the hams you meet on the air better operators. That will be better for the whole hobby.

>
>

> Rick Blank, KI5SL

Have a good weekend. I'll be sitting in front of my KWM-2A and homebrew amplifier talking to friendly hams all over the world. And I will also go to the Novice CW bands and have some FB QSOs with them. At least the novices are willing to talk, and not just hi-599-goodby-QRZ.

73,

Paul WA6OKQ

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 23:33:06 1994
Date: Thu, 10 Nov 94 11:14:27 UTC
Message-Id: <145@ki5sl.ampr.org>
From: ki5sl@ki5sl.ampr.org (Rick_Blank)
Subject: Re: Licensing Observations

In message <Pine.3.89.94111111322.A9232-01000000@netcom11> veltman@netcom.com writes:

>
> On Fri, 11 Nov 1994 Scott_Johnson-AZAX60@email.sps.mot.com wrote:
>
> >
> > Reply to: RE>Licensing Observations
> > What is wrong with extra technical testing in lieu
> > of code for those who wish it.
> >
> Absolutely nothing!
>
>
> >
> > A lot has been talked about on the list here about whether it is
> > good or bad to reduce the requirements for admission into the
> > higher echelons of amateur radio.
> >
> I've never been in favor of this so-called "incentive licensing" that was
> pushed through in 1968 by the ARRL. Just like this stupider than hell
> call sign setup that they have now. Every time that someone tries to
> make a distinction between two classes of people, it creates animosity
> and bad feelings. As far as I am concerned, there is only one class or
> echelon of ham radio operator. We should go back to the "class a and b"
> licenses and forget the rest.
>
>
> > My personal observations of a lot of the folks that have come into
> > the hobby from the "codeless" ranks are sometimes quite ignorant
> > of proper operating procedures, of how the different modes "work", and
> > of the history and historical equipment used in ham radio.
>
> That's not their fault. Get up off your fat ass and teach them the right
> way to do it. That will make a real ham out of them, and you too.
>
> > There is a group of SSB'ers that have started using 3870 as
> > "their" frequency. I know several of the fellows and get along
> > well with them. When they first started using the frequency
> > heavily a little over a year ago, I talked to a couple of them, in

> > person, and dropped the hint that that was in an "unofficial" AM
> > window...the kindest response I got was "BFD". Recently a gent
> > who is now signing /AG and I were talking and he said: "Boy,
> > those AM'ers were really tearing up the band last night,
> > splatterin' and howlin' all over the place." (His rig is a TS-140)
> > I proceeded to ask him how he discerned that they were
> > "splatterin'". His reply was that he could hear the "howl" and
> > then hear them on both sidebands when he tuned to zero beat,
> > therefore, they must be doing something wrong....this guy has a
> > general class license? He is a perfect example of "buy a ricebox,
> > put it on the air, disengage brain, engage mouth" hams.
> >
> See above remark. And since when is 3870 reserved for your exclusive
> use? It's always been the rule that the first station to occupy a given
> frequency has squatters rights. Again, give this guy a call and explain
> AM to him, he'll learn something, and maybe you will too. And you will
> have the satisfaction of knowing that you helped a new ham out.
>
>
> > I guess that I must be some kind of elitist scumbag because I
> > don't believe someone with as limited a knowledge of radio modes
> > and operation should have a general class license.
>
> Yeah, this is the first correct thing that you've said all day.
>
> > If "they" want
> > to reduce code requirements, then "they" should increase the
> > technical requirements...Yes, I am only an advanced, I have passed
> > the extra written, but I do not use CW enough to earn the 20wpm
> > priveledges, so I have not earned the Extra class license, I guess
> > I am too busy fooling with the old iron! Give me more technical
> > tests, and I will take them!
>
> So what! Put your time into making the hams you meet on the air better
> operators. That will be better for the whole hobby.
> >
> >
> > Rick Blank, KI5SL
>
> Have a good weekend. I'll be sitting in front of my KWM-2A and homebrew
> amplifier talking to friendly hams all over the world. And I will also
> go to the Novice CW bands and have some FB QSOs with them. At least the
> novices are willing to talk, and not just hi-599-goodby-QRZ.
>
> 73,
>
> Paul WA6OKQ
>

>
>

I am so glad that you have made your assumptions about me!
I got into ham radio to get away from the "anything goes" mentality of chicken banders and to be able to continue to increase my technical abilities. My knowledge, skills, and abilities are constantly on call for help to new and old hams alike....not only do I enjoy the old rigs, but, I work all HF digital modes except Clover and SSTV, am active on HF voice not only with AM but SSB also, regularly operate on AO-10, AO-13, RS-10, RS-12, operate on 2m FM and SSB, 70cm FM and SSB, 23cm FM and SSB, always have a packet node open on 2m and this is coming to the internet from a 19.2kbaud TCP/IP 430.55 wide area network a group of us here locally are developing.

These kind of activities are not enjoyed without a lot of close personal associations and support from other hams. We are all constantly learning or we are stagnant. I am constantly on the telephone with other folks, lots of new and old hams, who benefit from the mistakes I have made and the lessons I have learned, and I benefit from theirs....

I have worked closely with many new hams and always try not to "correct" them on the air, but will instead, present the example of a decent and courteous operator....kinda like what we wish all hams would be....I do believe in education by example and do support many educational activities for youngsters and new hams.

I am really sorry that you took my thoughts as condemnations of new folks, it's not, I am only saying that in today's instant gratification society there are all too many "spoiled children" with their whining ways complaining that things are too tough for them to achieve "right now!" I just want a little more education and a little more dedication to go into the process of becoming a ham....I think that's something the BA group has in common, the dedication to a little bit more than just the bare minimums.

I also never said that 3870 was owned by anybody, if you will note, I said "unofficial" AM window, which is just an area to try and find other AM'ers, much like you would find folks trying to help new hams and trying to polish up their CW in the Novice subbands.....I have talked to the person I mentioned, in fact, last night at the radio club meeting, and he just snickered, he's learned as much as he wants to learn...and this guy's a cop... maybe in another 20 years when his kids are grown and gone, he'll want to learn more...

BTW, class B amateur licenses required 13wpm CW, a knowledge of basic transmitter theory, and familiarity with the laws and amateur regulations before one went and sat before the FCC to be examined...Class A licenses were available to those who had been licensed for a year and passed further examinations...this does not fit in very well with today's VEC and don't know code licensing.

I do believe that the Technician- license has helped to populate our VHF and UHF bands to an unprecedented degree and, by the very nature of HF propagation, this kind of growth would be totally unacceptable...listen to the chicken band when there is a good band opening on 10m to see what I mean....besides, the bands we are in danger of losing are NOT our HF bands but the very bands where experimenters should be working, the EHF and SHF ranges. Have you written any letters to your Senators and Congressmen, your ARRL section manager and the FCC about the upcoming NPRM for taking away our use of portions of 2.3 ghz and 4.6 ghz and auctioning it off to the highest bidder? It opens in a few days.....one step at a time....and before you know it, it'll all be gone to commercial interests.

I have never claimed to be politically correct and at 6'2" and 200 lbs, I don't think my a** is fat! That really smarted, bucky!

Rick Blank, KI5SL
ki5sl@sat.ampr.org
2223 Blanco Road
San Antonio, Texas 78212
end

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 13:40:43 1994
From: djw@unlinfo.unl.edu (daniel wright)
Message-Id: <9411111727.AA02464@unlinfo.unl.edu>
Subject: mailer
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 11:27:52 -0600 (CST)

Well it looks like my mailer is not recognizing the site for boatanchors...goody goody.....[:<...
dan

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 20:25:48 1994
From: post@ouvaxa.cats.ohiou.edu

Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 19:11:05 EST
Message-Id: <00987520.70CCE860.11@ouvaxa.cats.ohiou.edu>
Subject: No code tech 'fesses up

Ohio University Electronic Communication

Date: 11-Nov-1994 06:55pm EST

To: Remote Addressee
(_MX%"boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu")

From: Richard Post
Services
POST

Dept: Instructional Media
Tel No:

Subject: No code tech 'fesses up

Yep! There's a no-code tech on the BA list! (Flame suit on.)
Part of the fun of amateur radio is learning and growing, elmering and being elmered, different strokes for different folks.
I first got interested in Ham radio as a 13 year old. Built a Heath AR-3 and Q-multiplier. Never had an Elmer nearby to show me how to homebrew a transmitter from TV parts, however, and before I could save enough paper-route money to buy a DX-35, I got sidetracked by girls, cars, college, grad school, etc. Electronics remained a hobby and I did pass the quizzes to pick up a First Class commercial (now somewhat detuned to a lesser commercial license).

The Tech entry has brought me back, 4 months now, and I wonder how many others are in similar shoes, coming back to an interest in ham radio after a long absence. My 2 meter friends think I'm a bit strange with talk about BC-348's and other heavy metal but there is room for all of us in the hobby. I'll bet there are even a few BA lurkers and contributors who may not even have a license yet. We all start someplace. So let's get the frozen 300 or so back on track to that wonderful old technology that we can get our hands into, and to those great yarns by boatanchor Bob and others.

Me? I'm gonna turn on that beautiful just-repaired silver anniversary National NC-200 with the speaker/ output transformer I had to home-brew and listen to some of those strange "beep beeps" on 40 meters emanating from an organization called ARRL. Who knows, one of these days I may even fire up that old Signal Shifter and do QRP with a key, or SSB with an HT (forty four that is, teamed up with the SX-117 on the shelf.) 73 de KB8TAD

Rich <post@ouvaxa.cats.ohiou.edu>

Received: 11-Nov-1994 07:10pm

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 14:41:46 1994
Message-Id: <n1427576879.65985@cpqm.saic.com>
Date: 11 Nov 1994 12:19:33 U
From: "Bob Scott" <Bob_Scott@cpqm.saic.com>
Subject: None

Found on AOL. Please respond to the originator.

Subj: HF Equipment 94-11-10 22:13:29 EST
>From: RR90

Ten-Tec Paragon Loaded Matching Pwr Supply.
Ten-Tec Electronic Keyer
Ten-Tec Desk Mic
Ten-Tec Ant Tunner Mod 238
Drake T4XC & R4C w/ matching Power Supply & Spkr Cables Books
Vibroplex Bugs (2)
Astatic D-104 Mic
All Ten-Tec Equip. Like New Little Use...Drake Equip. Vry Gud Cond.
Vibroplexes Excellant Cond.
Have all Recpts manuals Etc. Call for info & prices. 201-440-4678
KA4NY0 Bob

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 02:18:32 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 00:27:12 -0500 (EST)
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
Subject: Re: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.9411111000521.8903D-1000000@access3.digex.net>

Rick,

On Thu, 10 Nov 1994, Rick_Blank wrote:

> > I don't want this discussion to sink to the depths of name calling and
> > such ("flaming") although regrettably it seems to have already started.

First, I was mistaken about the "flaming." My apologies to the offended
for the error.

> I agree with you totally, Tony, in fact the closet thing I have
> found to the "fraternity" that ham radio used to be is the folks
> here on the BA mailgroup.

It certainly seems so! The bad news is that I'm neglecting other things more than I should while visiting here! It's nice to be among friends though.

> It just seems to me that there are very few technical discussions
> going on in ham radio today, just tune across the bands and the
> most technical stuff you'll hear on HF (aside from some of the
> AM'ers) is: "the rig here is a Yaecomwood 0U812-2000BMF with a
> 3-element 15db gain, 9-band Flamin'Star antenna that I assembled
> myself, etc, etc...", but I think you get the point, very few of
> the run of the mill hams know anything about HOW radio works!
> Just ask some of the new hams what the difference between the
> filter and phasing methods of sideband generation are, or, why you
> can hear AM stations on either sideband!

(Yaecom... Sounds familiar... Like ER #66? <G>)

Boy! Do I have one for you!!!

I had a TS-50S in the car and had worked a VK on 40 meters mobile earlier that day. I was talking to a no-code Technician (no offense meant by that characterization - it's just a statement of fact) and told him about how much fun HF mobile is. He said, "There's something I've been meaning to ask somebody. What's the difference in HF and single sideband?"

> Even the satellite guys are for the most part well trained
> appliance operators, I still operate thru A0-13, et al, but it's
> still not the same as putting a 30, 40, or 50 year old rig back
> into operating condition and using it on the air again!

To me, satellite operation is the epitome of appliance operation. To do it, first you buy a computer, interface card, software, an AZ-EL rotator, antenna, and a radio. After that, you plug it all together (excuse me: "interface it") and look for the time the satellite comes over, switch it all on and you have an instant band opening. It's quite an accomplishment for the all those folks at AMSAT and others to have pulled off getting the satellites up there, and it's great that they've done it, but to me, it's just a very expensive repeater. It doesn't interest me in the least. If I want satellite communications, I'll just pick up my phone, dial 011, country code, city code...

73,

Tony

K4KY0

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 11:36:11 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 09:49:55 -0500
From: CCS_MAH@admin.fandm.edu (Mark Hemlick Ph. D.)
Subject: Re: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio
Message-Id: <01HJCKEK2PKYAFUSL6@ACAD.FANDM.EDU>

Hello to all,

I want to put in my c.02, too.

>> It just seems to me that there are very few technical discussions
>> going on in ham radio today, just tune across the bands and the
>> most technical stuff you'll hear on HF (aside from some of the
>> AM'ers) is: "the rig here is a Yaecomwood 0U812-2000BMF with a
>> 3-element 15db gain, 9-band Flamin'Star antenna that I assembled
>> myself, etc, etc...", but I think you get the point, very few of
>> the run of the mill hams know anything about HOW radio works!
>> Just ask some of the new hams what the difference between the
>> filter and phasing methods of sideband generation are, or, why you
>> can hear AM stations on either sideband!

I'm not an engineer and have relatively little technical training. Even so, the "technical" aspects of the hobby are what interest me most. I would like to see the licensing process reconfigured to ensure greater technical and operating expertise, but at the same time I wouldn't want to see it get so rigorous that no one but an engineer could get licensed. My feeling is that the best way to do this is to eliminate standardized, published question pools. When I first got my novice about 15 years ago, there weren't (or at least I didn't know about) published question pools. I had to study the stuff and learn it, not just memorize it.

And another thing... To me, it's understandable why most hams probably don't know how a modern rig "works". They're so complicated, I'd bet that most engineers who are not RF specialists wouldn't know how they work. This is why boat anchors and qrp rigs are appealing to me. They're simpler and I can even make some of my own repairs. But, this simplicity doesn't seem to be emphasized to new, younger hams who, I think, see boatanchors as either 1. a "cheap" way to get started or 2. some sort of funky nostalgia trip for retired guys who were in WWII. This is not meant to be a flame, but just my observations of what some hams perceive boatanchors to be all about. I just want to suggest that boatanchors could be a way for hams with less technical training and ability to get more involved in the technical aspects of the hobby.

73 Mark KA3LFG

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 14:37:02 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 94 11:25:30 CST
Message-Id: <9411111725.AA02182@unlinfo.unl.edu>
From: djw@unlinfo.unl.edu (Daniel Wright)
Subject: Re: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio

Mark sez:

>Hello to all,
>
>I want to put in my c.02, too.

Well me too-too:

This is sorta like "how many flavors of ice-cream do you like?"
Assuming you like ice-cream(or ham radio as the case may be)....

There are SO MANY aspects to the radio hobby,AM,SSB,CW,FM,VHF-UHF,RAG CHEWING, CONTESTING,COLLECTING,RESTORING,BUYING,SELLING,SWL,UTILITIES,SCANNERS,OLD-TIME RADIO SHOWS,VLF,MF,BUILDING.....well you get the idea I hope! Why does one have to exist at the expense of some others??

I started in radio in the sixties and the technical aspects were/are certainly appealing. I also just loved to "operate" the stuff. There is skill involved in that too 'ya know. To me it's sort of like playing a musical instrument in some ways....a really great musician doesn't have to know how to build the instrument that is played. Skill is skill,whether it is in designing an electronic circuit or "playing" it.

In the early seventies,when it became obvious that I wasn't going to "make it" in the music biz,I got a really neat job in a Houston,Tx. integrated circuit testing lab because of the BASIC electronics I taught myself as a kid when I studied for my ham license. One thing always leads to another and now I am in Lincoln,Nebraska working in the television broadcast industry(yeah..we have stuff

like that out here..please keep it a secret!!). My point being that I am responsible for the maintenance of some of the most sophisticated state-o-de-art electronic stuff around and I got my start as a lowly novice. I am not the world's foremost expert on anything,but I have technical skill/knowledge that I am proud of and enables me to make a living.

I really,really enjoy working with BA rigs 'cause over the years I have forgotten a great deal of "vacuum tube theory". Probably not enough space in my brain for all the uProcessor and digital stuff AND BA theory!! I WANT to get more into the

historical-technical aspects of the way this stuff works 'cause even in this world of silicone and ceramic, the principles of communication electronics that drive the old stuff are very valid indeed.

The point(I think)of all this dis-jointed blathering is that IMHO,when we talk about quality...real quality in the amateur radio ranks,it needs to include operators and builders/designers,all of us,really.....

73 de Dan -- WA0JRD..

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 19:50:07 1994
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 14:43:53 -0500 (EST)
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
Subject: Re: Re: Dumbing down of Ham Radio
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.9411111140256.12465C-100000@access1.digex.net>

Hello Doctor Mark!

On Fri, 11 Nov 1994, Mark Hemlick Ph. D. wrote:

> I'm not an engineer and have relatively little technical training. Even
> so, the "technical" aspects of the hobby are what interest me most.

I can identify with that. I was a wannabe EE that switched to the industrial engineering discipline when I realized my low math aptitude would require a lighter academic load and extend my college career beyond 4 years. The budget was already stretched to the limit. Anyway, amateur radio is a hobby rather than a competitive or (necessarily) a developmental field and it's a place where folks like me can have the satisfaction of fixing something, or building something from a kit or scratch. I can't tell you the thrill I got from having my first Heathkit light up and actually work, or bringing home a bag of parts, tube sockets, tubes, and a Bud chassis and before the weekend was out, turn it into something that I could plug my J-38 (that's a KEY to the no-coders out there <G>) into and ACTUALLY communicate with. Truthfully, I wouldn't consider tackling fixing a surface mount radio, but I did go through my TR-7 schematic and figure out how the frequency control worked and modified it to transmit on the MARS frequencies without the AUX-7 board. That was gratifying too.

> I would like to see the licensing process reconfigured to ensure greater
> technical and operating expertise, but at the same time I wouldn't want to
> see it get so rigorous that no one but an engineer could get licensed. My
> feeling is that the best way to do this is to eliminate standardized,
> published question pools. When I first got my novice about 15 years ago,
> there weren't (or at least I didn't know about) published question pools.
> I had to study the stuff and learn it, not just memorize it.

I completely agree with you on that, but it's not likely to happen. The problem is the VEC program and distributing the question pools. I'm told that the Freedom of Information Act would not allow keeping them confidential.

Back before the VEC program, Dick Bash (again, I think that's who it was) stood outside FCC examination places and (it was said) paid \$5 if an examinee could give him one complete question. He published that era's book of question pools and the FCC went nuts! They did everything they could to block him. However, they now see nothing wrong with publishing question pools. So what's the difference?

When I was in college, two student assistants were expelled for copying a big pool of questions one of the professors used. Having the exact questions was considered cheating. I still do.

> I just want to suggest that boatanchors could be a way for hams
> with less technical training and ability to get more involved in the
> technical aspects of the hobby.

I have a good friend who got a no-code Tech, he said, as a stepping stone to upgrading. I found an almost mint Swan 500 at about 75% of the going price and told him that this was a great deal and listening to the HF bands would give him encouragement to upgrade. He cried poverty, but interestingly bought a Yeacom 2 & 3/4 meter dual band FM rig only a couple of weeks later. I wrote him off as a career repeater operator. Oh well...

Getting back to your point, I very much agree with you. Building a scratch built 6AG7/6L6 CW transmitter is easy to do and as I mentioned above, it gives a tremendous amount of tangible satisfaction that sticking IC's into a PC board won't. Having code as a requirement for the license makes that kind of thing possible too.

OK, I'll put the soap box away (again), but hopefully it puts my point of view regarding "slow code" and "dumbing down" a little more into perspective.

73,

Tony
K4KY0

From owner-boatanchors@gnu.ai.mit.edu Fri Nov 11 16:02:03 1994
From: KANAMAA%AMGATE%MATRXA@randb.abbott.com
Date: Fri, 11 Nov 1994 13:07:45 -0500 (CDT)
Subject: VLF receiver info

Message-Id: <01HJCREGJHLUFODA96@RANDB.PPRD.Abbott.Com>

>From: Kana, Michael (D9CY)
Date: Fri, Nov 11, 1994 1:10 PM
Subject: VLF receiver info
To: boatanchors
Howdy all

I have a lead on a Rycom 1307A VLF receiver. I think the range is from 14kc to 600+ kc. Has anyone ever worked with such an animal or have any info on them. The guy that has one sez that it is a hybrid receiver. Izdatso? Any info would be appreciated.

73's de AA9IL
Mike Kana